

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated April 25, 2008, applicant submits the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 33-38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 are pending.  
Claims 1, 13, 16, 28, 33 are independent.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the opportunity of the telephonic interview on July 16, 2008. The participants in the interview were Examiner Nguyen and Applicant's representatives Daniel Burns and Andrew Leung.

During the interview claims 1 and 9 were discussed in view of the prior art. No agreement was reached regarding the claims.

### **Section 101**

Claims 16-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 41, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 16 and 28 are directed to computer program products tangibly embodied in a machine-readable medium. The specification had described a computer program product as "a computer program tangibly embodied in an information carrier, e.g., in a machine readable storage device or in a propagated signal." The specification has been amended to strike the phrase "or in a propagated signal." The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 41, and 43, in view of the amended specification, are directed to statutory subject matter.

### Section 103

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-19, 23, 24, 26-28, 30, 33-38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US20040006744 (“Jones”) in view of 7,054,924 (“Harvey”). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 recites “selecting a suggestion template from among multiple suggestion templates according to the particular kind of the validation error, and using the selected suggestion template to suggest to a user suggested corrections that are predefined in the template for the particular kind of validation error, the selected suggestion template including logic necessary to implement the suggested corrections to the document to correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect; receiving an input selecting one of the suggested corrections; and using the logic in the selected suggestion template to apply the correction selected by the input to the XML electronic document.”

Jones teaches “error data [which] may also include further information related to the error, such as suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error which may be displayed to the user” (Jones, paragraph 0034). The Examiner, admitting that Jones does not teach the use of templates, cites Harvey as teaching the use of templates. However, Jones and Harvey, alone or in combination, are not understood to teach or suggest that the suggestions include logic to apply the suggestions. Jones merely provides “suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error,” which is not a suggestion that includes the logic necessary to implement the suggested changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document. In other words, suggestions to possibly rectify an error do not disclose or suggest the capacity of the suggestion template to correct that particular error. Harvey does not remedy the deficiency, as the addition of the templates of Harvey to Jones does not teach or suggest that the templates include logic to apply the correction; the templates can merely map errors to suggestions about how to rectify the error but not include the logic to actually implement the suggestions. In contrast, the claimed suggestion template includes the logic (e.g., commands, recognition and

replacement patterns, etc.) necessary to implement the suggested corrections in a document to correct a specific error (e.g., a non-conforming structural aspect).

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Jones and Harvey, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 16 and 33

Claims 16 and 33 include features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 16 and 33 are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13 and 28

Claims 13 and 28 include features corresponding to those of claim 1 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claims 13 and 28 are allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claims 13 and 28 recite the additional features of recursive validation. The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Jones and Harvey, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 13 and 28.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from independent claims 1, 13, 16, 28, and 33 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jones in view of Harvey as applied to claims 1 and 16 above and further in view of US20040268304 (“Kuo”). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 9 and 24 depend from claims 1 and 16, respectively, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 16, respectively. Claims 9 and 24 are further allowable for at least the reasons described below.

Claim 9

Claim 9 recites “suggesting changes to the user includes suggesting a plurality of changes to the user in an order determined by predefined user preferences, the predefined user preferences including ranking particular changes higher than other changes.” The Examiner, admitting that Jones and Harvey do not teach this feature, cited Kuo paragraphs 0048-0053, 0098, 0102, 0106. The cited paragraphs of Kuo are understood to teach a user making element additions or deletions to a document. However, those cited paragraphs are not understood to teach or suggest predefined user preferences, or that any predefined user preferences include ranking particular changes higher than other changes. Thus, Jones, Harvey, and Kuo, alone or in combination, do not teach all limitations of claim 9.

Claim 24

Claim 24 include features corresponding to those of claim 9 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claim 24 is allowable for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 9.

**Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 July 2008

Andrew Leung  
Andrew H. Leung  
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No. 21876  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071